Application No. Applicant(s) 10/664,899 NAKANO, HIROSHI Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit Kaitlin S. Joerger 3653 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Kaitlin S. Joerger. (4) (2) Scott Schulte. Date of Interview: 14 December 2006. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5, 7, and 9. Identification of prior art discussed: ___ Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) ⋈ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The differences between the claimed invention and the applied prior art was discussed and pointed out. However, the amendment after final raises new issues and the examiner will be sending out an advisory action.. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

PATRICK MACKEY SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required